



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,372	02/08/2001	Newton James Smith JR.	AUS920000884US1	6030

7590 01/04/2005
Robert H. Frantz
P.O. Box 23324
Oklahoma City, OK 73123-2334

EXAMINER

MISTRY, O NEAL RAJAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/779,372

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

O'Neal R Mistry

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on February 08, 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined.

Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Drawings

The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on February 08, 2001 are acceptable for the examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feng et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,483,523) in view of Ruberg et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,538,688).

Feng shows a personalized interface browser for viewing information in a data bank. The display browser allows the user to set option depending on user preference. The customized interface is viewed through different browsers that are located on the separate terminals but does not show the ability to display multiple personalization with in multiple application.

Ruberg et al shows a distributed settings control protocol that provides the ability for an application on a server and throughout the entire network. The human interface

Art Unit: 2173

device is allowed to store information on the system item, to allow personal customization, also permitting settings to be mobile from human interface device to another, which lets the same user to have multiple customizations on different human interface devices.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the mobile distributed setting in a human interface device, Ruberg, with personalized interface browser, Feng, for the reason that the modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to search for a personalized browser which permits multiple different authentication for a single user over an entire network.

1. In regards to claim 1, the combination of Feng and Ruberg discloses processor-based system for setting accessibility performance characteristics comprising the steps of:

providing a plurality of accessibility profiles, each accessibility profile containing one or more definitions of system accessibility performance characteristics for a particular application program or system function; (Feng col. 2 lines 18-20 & col. 3 lines 33-38); The examiner interprets that the user has the ability to choose a unique ID from a list of ID's, and each ID having its exclusive configuration for each user, even if it is located on a human interface device.

upon simultaneous execution of two or more application programs or operation of two or more system functions, determining which of the plurality of accessibility profiles to make effective according to a system accessibility policy (Ruberg col. lines 32- 36 &

Art Unit: 2173

col. 2 lines 40-43). The examiner interprets that if a user is allowed to use different human interface devices which are mobile and the HID are independent of each other, the user can access multiple HID with different profiles, and be able to access different two or more system functions; and

setting system accessibility performance characteristics according to definitions contained within a selected accessibility profile determined according to the policy. (Feng col. 2 lines 9-22). The examiner interprets that the system has the capability of choosing the settings by the unique ID.

2. In regards to claim 2, the combination of Feng and Ruberg states assigning an accessibility profile to a system function or application program selected by a user from a plurality of application programs or system functions; and (Feng col. 2 lines 11-22 & Ruberg col. 2 lines 24-29) The examiner interprets that the HID has the ability to maintain profile configuration for applications on each current users, and interacts with server. In addition, the HID allows multiple entities to modify and configure the settings;

setting system accessibility performance characteristics according to definitions contained within a the assigned accessibility profile when a system function is operated or application program is executed (Feng col. 3 lines 30-34)

3. In regards to claim 3, the combination of Feng and Ruberg states the step of launching at least one companion application program or operating at least one companion system function as defined by the accessibility profile (Feng col. 3 lines 25-29).

4. In regards to claim 4, Feng states the step of providing a plurality of accessibility profiles comprises providing a name for each accessibility profile (Feng col. 3 lines 33-40 & col. 3 lines 45-51).

5. In regards to claim 5, the combination of Feng and Ruberg states the step of providing a plurality of accessibility profiles comprises providing groups of accessibility profiles such that each group of accessibility profiles inherits the system accessibility performance characteristic definitions of its constituent accessibility profiles (Feng col. 3 lines 45-61).

6. In regards to claim 6, the combination of Feng and Ruberg discloses the step of transferring or copying one or more accessibility profiles from one system to another system (Feng col.3 lines 33-38).

7. In regards to claim 7, the combination of Feng and Ruberg discloses step of providing accessibility profiles comprises providing an association between accessibility profiles and user names or user identifiers (Feng col. 3 lines 33-38)

8. Claims 8 & 15 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claim 8 & 15 are rejected because of similar rationale.

9. Claims 9 & 18 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claim 9 & 18 are rejected because of similar rationale.

10. Claims 10 & 17 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claim 10 & 17 are rejected because of similar rationale.

11. Claims 11 & 21 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claim 11 & 21 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2173

12. Claims 12 & 19 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claim 12 & 19 are rejected because of similar rationale.

13. Claims 13 & 20 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claim 13 & 20 are rejected because of similar rationale.

14. Claims 14 & 22 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claim 14 & 22 are rejected because of similar rationale.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to O'Neal R Mistry whose telephone number is (703) 305-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W Cabeca can be reached on (703)308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O'Neal Mistry
Assistant Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2173
o'neal.mistry@uspto.gov



RAYMOND J. BAYER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173